

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Vignina 22313-1450

			• • •	
APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/615,104	07/13/2000	Takashi Ohsaki	M1873-21	4085
	590 09/25/2003			
Morrison Law Firm 145 North Fifth Avenue			EXAMINER	
Mt Vernon, NY			HENDRICKSON, STUART L	
,			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
		•	1754	
			DATE MAILED: 09/25/2003	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application N	Applicant(s)				
Office Action Summary	pt 21.91	<u> </u>				
omee rienen Gammary	Examine	Group Art Unit				
	NAM CO	× (184				
-The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet beneath the correspondence address -						
Period for Reply	2	•				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.						
 Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely. If NO period for reply is specified above, such period shall, by default, expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.Ć. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). 						
Status						
A Responsive to communication(s) filed on	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·					
☐ This action is FINAL.		•				
 Since this application is in condition for allowance except for accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C 	r formal matters, pros D. 1 1: 453 O.G. <i>2</i> 13	ecution as to the merits is closed in				
Disposition of Claims						
Of the above claim(s) 10-12	·	is/am nonding in the analizati				
Of the above claim(s) 10-12	is/are withdrawn from consideration.					
☐ Claim(s)	_ is/are allowed.					
(x) Claim(s) 124-6, 8, 9, 13-19	_ is/are rejected.					
☐ Claim(s)	is/are objected to					
DR Claim(s) 12468-19		are subjected to				
Application Papers requirement						
☐ The proposed drawing correction, filed on is ☐ approved ☐ disapproved.						
☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are objected to by the Examiner						
☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.						
☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.						
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d)						
☐ Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119 (a)–(d).						
☐ All ☐ Some* ☐ None of the:						
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.						
☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No						
☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received						
in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a))						
*Certified copies not received:	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	<u> </u>				
ttachment(s)	1 4					
Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s).		rview Summary, PTO-413				
Notice of Reference(s) Cited, PTO-892						
☐ Notice f Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948	•	ce of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152				
Other						
Office Action Summary						
had a set of the set o						

U.S. Patent and Trademark Office PTO-326 (Rev. 11/00) Art Unit: 1754

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action. The request filed on 7/16/03 for Continued Examination (RCE) based on parent Application No. 09/615104 is acceptable.

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 9, 13-19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Jose-Yacaman et al article, with Ota et al. and Nolan et al. cited for inherent properties.

This is the same rejection made in paper 9, incorporated herein by reference And noting that a metal particle is taught.

Claims 1, 2, 5, 6, 13, 14, 16, 17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(a) as anticipated by or, in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Chang 5916642.

Chang teaches in the figures and col. 5-6 copper inside a hollow nanotube. See also col. 2 line 66. No difference is seen, even though the material is described differently.

Applicant's arguments filed 7/16/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Jose-Yacaman teaches a tube whose grain is a spiral. This is not a scroll, as argued.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to examiner Hendrickson at telephone number (703) 308-2539.

Stuart Hendrickson examiner Art Unit 1754